

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/706,667	11/06/2000	Arnold Karel Jansen Van Doorn	PHN-17.714	8978	
24737 7	7590 06/23/2005		EXAM	INER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			PAYNE, DAVID C		
P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2638		
			DATE MAILED: 06/23/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	٠		
	J		
ı	L		
•			

Advisory Action				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief				

Application No. App		Applicant(s)		
09/706,667		JANSEN VAN DOORN, ARNOLD KAREL		
ĺ	Examiner	Art Unit		
	David C. Payne	2638		

		, Cini				
	David C. Payne	2638				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 June 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follot places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of	-	- 6 111				
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th	b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the do of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appearance a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			because			
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 		IE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) $oxtimes$ They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))		amaliant Amaandmaan	(DTOL 224)			
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1. 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s 		ompilani Amendmeni	(PTOL-324).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling					
the non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)		rill be entered and an	explanation of			
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	vided below or appended.					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 3, and 5-7</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: 7, 3, and 3-7. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appery and was not earlier presented.	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after o	entry is below or attac	ched.			
Applicant's assertion that the Chen filter does not teach and 3 of the prior art. Furthermore, applicant argues lin the claim language as argued and whose relevance to t	The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's assertion that the Chen filter does not teach an adaptive filter as claimed as been specifically addresssed in col. 2 and 3 of the prior art. Furthermore, applicant argues limitations concering filtering in band of the upstream signal is not part of the claim language as argued and whose relevance to the claims at hand are not clear. Applicant's arguments are non- persuasive, the finality of the rejection stands.					
persuasive, the finality of the rejection stands. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13. Other:						
13. Other:		M	, <u> </u>			

David C. Payne
Patent Examiner
AU 2638

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20050620